

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Office Action mailed on March 6, 2009. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the amendments made above and the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-16 are pending in this application, where claims 9-16 have been currently added. Claim 1 is independent.

By means of the present amendment, claims 1-8 have been amended for non-statutory reasons, such as for better form including beginning the dependent claims with 'The' instead of 'A', changing "characterized in that" to --wherein--, and deleting reference designations typically used in European practice that are known to not limit the scope of the claims. Such amendments to claims 1-8 were not made in order to address issues of patentability and Applicant respectfully reserve all rights under the Doctrine of Equivalents.

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that the title of the invention is not sufficiently descriptive, and required a new title. In response, the current title has been deleted and

substituted with a new title in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claim 1 for a certain informality. Without agreeing and to advance prosecution, claim 1 has been amended to remove the alleged informality. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to claim 1 is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-2, 4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,227,679 (Zhang). Further, claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Zhang in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,463,280 (Johnson). Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Zhang. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Zhang in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,739,169 (Weinreich). Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Zhang in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,478,891 (Bernier). It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-16 are patentable over Zhang, Johnson, Weinreich and Bernier for at least the following reasons.

Zhang is directed to an light emitting diode (LED) light bulb including many LEDs, a support structure and a planar disc. The planar disc is a printed circuit board and is perpendicularly

oriented with respect to the support structure. As shown in FIG 1, the LEDs are concentrically mounted on the disc and a portion of the LEDs are outwardly splayed at an angle away from a central axis point of the disc so that the LEDs collectively transmit light having about the same light intensity at viewing angles from about 0 about 360 degrees. A light transmissive cap 28 encloses the LEDs.

It is respectfully submitted that Zhang does not disclose or suggest the present invention as recited in independent claim 1 which recites (illustrative emphasis provided):

at least a light source for emitting light rays and being oriented along a source axis; and
a lens for guiding said light rays on a projection plane; the lens presenting a cylindrical portion extending along a lens axis perpendicular to said projection plane and to said source axis, and at least a convex shaped surface extending at an extremity of said cylindrical portion and adapted to direct a portion of the light rays emitted from said light source towards said projection plane.

A light source oriented along a source axis, and a lens having a lens axis which is perpendicular to the projection plane and to the source axis is nowhere disclosed or suggested in Zhang. Rather, Zhang discloses a light transmissive cap 28 having an axis


perpendicular to the disc, but NOT perpendicular to the any axes of the LEDs.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 is allowable, and allowance thereof is respectfully requested. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-16 should also be allowed at least based on their dependence from independent claim 1, as well as their individually patentable elements. Accordingly, separate consideration of each of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

In addition, Applicant denies any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicant reserves the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703
Attorney for Applicant(s)
August 28, 2009

THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP
Applied Technology Center
111 West Main Street
Bay Shore, NY 11706
Tel: (631) 665-5139
Fax: (631) 665-5101